Appl. No. 10/599,765 Amdt. dated April 30, 2009 Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2009

REMARKS

Claim 25 has been amended to include limitations similar to those in the corresponding European application which is now granted. Claim 26 has been canceled and new claim 31 has been added.

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants hereby elect claims 19-24 (and claim 31 which has been added to depend from claim 19). This election is made with traverse.

Independent method claim 19 relates to the novel use of a two-part die for casting, and independent apparatus claim 25 relates to a novel two-part die which is suitable for use in the method of claim 19. The fact that apparatus claim 25 recites specific die features which are not recited in method claim 19 does not result in non-unity of invention. The underlying concept common to both method claim 19 and apparatus claim 25 is that one part of the die is removably placed inside another part of the die, allowing the parts to be handled differently to achieve certain advantages explained in the specification. The novel use of the two-part die for casting (method claim 19) implicitly includes use of the die recited in claim 25. To exemplify this point, new claim 31 has been added to recite explicitly use of a die with the same features as those recited in claim 25. Accordingly, it is believed that there is unity of invention between the independent method and apparatus claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/darin j gibby/ Darin J. Gibby Reg. No. 38,464

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834 Tel: 303-571-4000

Fax: 415-576-0300

DJG/cl 61925313 v1